latcho
latcho
latcho
latcho

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps·

As a broadcast television viewer and consumer of electronics and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am outraged that the FCC would consider a regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The broadcast flag is neither in my interest nor the public's interest. It will prevent me from watching digital broadcast television in the ways I currently enjoy analog broadcast television—for example, it will restrict my ability to move the video I have recorded for personal viewing from room–to–room and place–to–place

The broadcast flag will also lock out my computer as a way to watch my favorite shows using my choice of software on a plane or train, or to send a television clip of a high school football game to family and friends

Furthermore, if computers cannot freely receive digital television, how can I expect creative developers to discover new devices that enable me to use content in exciting ways I haven't even thought of? I value innovative devices like TiVo, ReplayTV and the Windows Media Center PC, which exist today because they were built to open standards using inexpensive, off–the–shelf computer parts.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital television equipment? A prettier picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and viewer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

latcho

Chuck Coxhead
109 Krista Court
Chalfont, PA 18914

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them.

Imposing bans on the development of open source software for a given purpose only serves to restrict the marketplace. As the current marketplace is dominated by 1 company, these actions by the FCC would, in my opinion, support monopolistic practices.

We are a country built on freedom and capitalism. Your efforts to protect the broadcasting companies may offer a brief stumbling block, but history has proven the power of freedom and capitalism.

The FCC and those who would lobby for this decision are incredibly naive to believe that us of these evolving technologies will not require an evolution of their business model, as well.

There are more ways to innovate than just using microchips.

Sincerely,

Chuck Coxhead

Shawn De Cesari
14 Sabra Street
Cranston, RI 02910

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Shawn De Cesari

per funke
skolmastaregat 2-4a
se-70220 Orebro Sweden

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps·

In my opinion, actions that stop open source code construction and use is

slowing down the amount of development per timeslice during the period

of time humanity has got to make a life.

Generally speaking, I think the belief in the market economy has to be

revised. There may be other market mechanisms speeding up the development

of whatever facilities we need to survive. The individuals that won't

take these matters into consideration are selfish and probably suffering

from low morale. And yes, the opposite is also correct

I resent standpoints which clearly promotes individual/organisational

enrichment or refuse to take into consideration, what's best for

the majority of living creatures. The broadcast flag is just another

nail in the coffin in which we will bury our eficiency on the altar

of "Oh God, make me richer".

Marketing force my ass, these guys are just plain stupid

if they think that their personal goals are in line with what's best

for the rest of the world. Now, I do know that they are not stupid.

So the only thing left governing their actions is low morale.

Sorry I'm murdering the English language but what can I do...

Sincerely,

per funke

Alec M Singer
1030 Setim Ceen
999 House
Partman, RI

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J Copps

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

QUIT LETTING THESE MEDIA ASSHOLES CONTROL OUR LIVES !!!

Sincerely,

Alec M Singer

Kurt Stephens
5183 Pinetree Drive
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a
"broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag
will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its
proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems
that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are
computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant
innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM
modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital
communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with
television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are
able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television.
Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to
watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to
promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Kurt Stephens

1

Srini Palthepu
228 Cortez CT
Naperville IL 60563

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Srini Palthepu

Brian Walsh
PO Box 313
—
Barrington, IL 60011

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Brian Walsh

November 5, 2003

Commissioner Michael J Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D C 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television Thank you for your time

Sincerely,

David Wilson
4730 St Marc Ct
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034
USA

George Arndt
31550 Fillmore Rd
New Carlisle, IN 46552

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users (including myself) of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software, as well as our country's economic strength. Our contributions and constant innovation are what make open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Having a PhD in Computer Science, I would be free to offer my statements before any subcommittee as appropriate.

Sincerely,

George Arndt

1

Jason Ballard
5400 W Parmer Ln
Austin, Tx 78727

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag" I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Jason Ballard

1

Bob Radvanovsky
1706 Millbrook Court
Geneva, IL 60134

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Bob Radvanovsky

Leif Ericksen
412 Prides Run
Lake in the Hills, IL 60156

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Leif Ericksen

1

Braxton Beyer
PO Box 92952
Austin, TX 78709

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Braxton Beyer

Michael Brummit
1050 Secrest St #2
Golden, CO 80401

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Michael Brummit

Dominick Bruno Jr.
1311 Central Avenue
Highland Park, NJ 08904

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Dominick Bruno Jr.

1

Cody Bryant
128 Tiger Lilly LN
Burnsville, NC 28714

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Cody Bryant

Jason Voegele
40 Cemetery Ridge
Apt 47
Fort Thomas, KY 41075

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps·

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Jason Voegele

1

Bruce Miller
11201–D Pear Tree Way
Columbia, MD 21044

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Bruce Miller

Rick Hendrix
4508 S. Elm Ave
Broken Arrow, OK 74012

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Rick Hendrix

Brian Ristuccia – KB1IRS
0 Sharon St.
Tewksbury, MA 01876-3233

Commissioner Michael J Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps.

Thousands of American consumers have already

expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption

of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them

As a developer of open-source software, and an

amateur radio operator, the broadcast flag will

make it impossible for me to collaborate with

my peers while also comply with open-source

software license requirements and the FCC rules.

Since I would not be able to freely share the

source code and designs behind my work while

also complying with the broadcast flag

requirements, it would be difficult for me to

collaborate with other hobbyists. I would also

have to start from scratch to avoid licensing

problems with existing Free code for video

processing, display, and tuner control All of

these existing programs require that derivative

works be released under an open-source license,

something that the broadcast flag rules propose

I not be allowed to do. With the broadcast flag,

the effort required to produce my own software

for digital television would be enormous. The

broadcast flag requirement will effectively

preclude me from working on my own digital

television software or hardware

Currently I enjoy the ability to work on

software which receives, records, and replays

television signals, using off the shelf add–in

TV receiver cards and freely available software.

With the special permissions granted by my

amateur radio license, I can even transmit my own

analog television signals for experimental and

communication purposes. With the change to

digital television and the broadcast flag,

these abilities will go away. I'll be forced

to use expensive dedicated hardware or

complicated and expensive proprietary software

which I am unable to customize to suit my

personal preferences or for use on the amateur

radio bands. The costs may be significant

enough to cause me to forgo digital television

altogether.

Making it difficult or impossible for users

of open–source computer systems to use digital

television will not spread the adoption of

digital television. In fact, it will do the

opposite by increasing costs, complexity, and

forcing developers to reimplement rather than

reuse existing open—source technology. We can —

and should — do without the broadcast flag.

Please oppose the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Brian Ristuccia — KB1IRS

Nils Johnson
100 Haven Ave. #10A
New York, NY 10032

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street. NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open–source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open–source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open–source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open–source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open–source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open–source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Nils Johnson

Vincent De Benedetto
2 Forest Court
Passaic, NJ 07055

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Greetings,

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open—source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open—source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open—source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open—source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open—source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open—source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Regards,

Vince De Benedetto

www.NonDigital.org

Sincerely,

Vincent De Benedetto

1